

Application No. 10/655,162
Reply to Office Action of 10/24/05

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 21, 23, 37, and 40 are amended to specify the range of a rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio of the rosin and terpene-phenol that are reacted together to form the resin of the present invention. Claim 25 is amended to correct the spelling of the word "sufonic" to -- sulfonic--. Support for the new claims is found throughout the specification and in the originally filed claims, but specifically at page 3, lines 8-18, page 8, line 28, to page 9, line 2, page 16, line 1, to page 17, line 3, Table 1, and in the originally filed claims. No new matter is believed to be added to by the amendment above.

Claims 21-41 are pending.

At the outset, Applicants thank Examiner Zemel for her helpful explanations of the rejections and suggestions to overcome the same in the Office Action dated October 24, 2005. Applicants further thank Examiner Zemel for explaining her position that US'156 is neutral towards the rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio that is used therein and does not disclose the criticality of any range in the rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio. In light thereof, Applicants have amended the present claims to recite a specific range of rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratios that is about 50:50 or greater, in part, for the process of the present invention to make, in part, the resins of the present invention.

The rejections of Claim 21-41 under 103(a) over either of US 2,284,156 (US'156) and/or US 6,054,606 (US'606) and/or Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary are believed to be obviated by the above amendment because none of the above mentioned references, in isolated or in combination, disclose or suggest a process for producing a resin by reacting rosin with a terpene-phenol resin in the presence of a Bronsted acid, where the

Application No. 10/655,162
Reply to Office Action of 10/24/05

rosin and terpene-phenol are reacted together in a rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio that is about 50:50 or greater, as well as a resin made by this process.

As Examiner Zemel kindly explains, neither US'156 nor US'606, discloses the criticality of any range in the rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio.

In direct contrast thereto, the present invention relates, in part, to a resin and a process for producing a resin by reacting rosin with a terpene-phenol resin in the presence of a Bronsted acid where the rosin and terpene-phenol are reacted together in a rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio that is about 50:50 or greater. The criticality of this range is provided by the attached Exhibit 1, which contains comparative data demonstrating that resins made with conditions such that a rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio is about 50:50 or greater produce adhesive formulations having much greater contact cement peel (lb/inch) as compared to those adhesive formulations containing resins made under conditions outside the claimed invention (e.g. when the rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio is less than 50:50). It should be noted that as the contact cement peel (lb/inch) number of an adhesive formulation increases, so does the resistance of that adhesive formulation to peeling. Therefore, the claimed resins made by the claimed process conditions when a rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio is about 50:50 or greater provide enhanced resistance to peel to adhesive formulations.

In sum, Applicants provide herewith Exhibit 1 containing comparative data demonstrating the criticality of the claimed range of conditions for making the claimed resin. Neither US'156 nor US'606, disclose or suggest the criticality of any range in the

Application No. 10/655,162
Reply to Office Action of 10/24/05

rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio, let alone the claimed range. Further, no combination of US'156 with US'606 discloses or suggests the criticality of any range in the rosin:terpene-phenol weight ratio, let alone the claimed range. Finally, nothing found in Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary appears to make up for the lack of disclosure and/or suggestion within US'156 and/or US'606. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all grounds of rejections based upon any combination of US 2,284,156 (US'156) and/or US 6,054,606 (US'606) and/or Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

3-24-06; 6:45PM; IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT


; 513 248 6455

15/ 16

Application No. 10/655,162
Reply to Office Action of 10/24/05

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. Should anything further be required to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact below-signed by telephone.

Please charge the amount of \$450.00 required for the request for extension of time to our Deposit Account No. 09-0525. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 09-0525. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time.

Correspondence Client Number: 01726 (513) 248-6736 (phone) (513) 248-6445 (fax)	Respectfully Submitted, 	
	Thomas W. Barnes III, Ph.D.	
	Registration No.	52,595